

## REGISTER OF CLASSIFICATION DECISIONS

Date of entry in Register:	16 December 1999
Name of applicant/court:	The District Court at Christchurch
Applicant to the Labelling Body:	Not Applicable
Title of Publication:	Untitled
Other Known Titles:	DIA Exhibit #36
Director:	Not Applicable
Producer:	Not Applicable
Publisher:	Not Applicable
Author:	Not Applicable
Format:	Computer Printout
Country of Origin:	Not Applicable
Language:	Not Applicable

.....  
**Components of film originally examined:** Not Applicable.

Feature:	Running time:
Trailers:	Running time:
	Total Running time:

Excision/Alteration: Not Applicable.

Reason(s) for Excision:

Not Applicable.

... Please turn over

Classification Decision:

Objectionable.

Display Conditions:

Not Applicable.

Descriptive Note:

Not Applicable.

.....

Direction to issue a label has been given on: Not Applicable.

.....

**SUMMARY OF THE REASONS FOR DECISION:**

The untitled computer printout also known as *DIA Exhibit #36* is classified as:  
Objectionable.

The computer printout is one of a total of 12 computer printouts and 18 computer image files which were submitted together for the purposes of classification. The computer printout comprises an A4 sheet of white paper containing three colour photographic images. Two of the images depict males aged in their mid-teens engaging in sexual activity. The third image depicts a male, also aged in his mid-teens, removing his jeans to reveal his genitals.

The computer printout promotes and supports the exploitation of young persons for sexual purposes, deeming the publication objectionable under s3(2) of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act 1993 (FVPC Act). The Classification Office considers that given the characteristics of the publication, the main purpose of the computer printout is the titillation or sexual arousal of adults with a sexual interest in children or young persons.

Referring to New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBR Act) issues, the application of s3(2) of the FVPC Act deems the publication objectionable. As a deeming provision, s3(2) is evidence of Parliament's intention that publications to which those criteria apply should be banned. It is therefore not possible to give s3(2) an interpretation that is consistent with the freedom of expression contained in the NZBR Act. The limit on freedom of expression resulting from the classification is a reasonable limit prescribed by law and is demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

OFLC Ref: 9901764